

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-39 remain in this application.

In response to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2005, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 14 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated over Morgan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,824). The Examiner states that Morgan discloses "an input interface for receiving a packet from a rasterizer(Fig. 6, Item No. 604, col. 8, lines 53-54); a shading processing mechanism configured to produce a resultant value from said packet by performing one or more shading operations (Fig. 6, Item No. 642; col. 4, lines 52-55), wherein said shading operations comprise both texture operations and color operations (col. 9, lines 19-30); and an output interface configured to send said value to a frame buffer (col. 9, lines 30-31)." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

A claim is not anticipated unless each and every element is taught in a single reference. Here Morgan fails to teach an element of the claimed invention, namely that both texture operations and color operations are performed on the received packet. By contrast, Morgan does not perform both texture and color operations on the received packet. Instead, Moran requires two passes of data through its system. In one pass, color operations are performed, in a second pass, texture operations are performed by the shader. The packet acted on by these two passes is not the same packet that first enters the shader. Rather, the packet is already modified after a first pass through the graphics subsystem.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-13, 15-26 and 28-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,824) in view of Zatz (U.S. Patent No. 6,864,893). Applicant respectfully disagrees. These claims, being dependent on allowable base claims, are themselves allowable.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-39 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

A Petition for Extension of Time is filed with this Amendment and Response to Office Action. No additional fee is believed due with the submission of this paper. However, if the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees from Deposit Account No. 502811.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 3, 2005



J.D. Harriman II
Reg. No. 31,967
Customer Number 30076
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90067-1621